

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In view of both the amendments presented above and the following discussion, the Applicants submit that none of the claims now pending in the application are obvious under the provisions of 35 USC § 103 (a). Thus, the Applicants believe that all of these claims are now in allowable form.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues in any of the claims now pending in the application, the Examiner should telephone Ms. Janet M. Skafar, Esq. at message telephone number (408) 463-5670 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

#### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-20 and 25-33 are pending in this application. Claims 21-24 are withdrawn. Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 25, 26, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, and 33 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention.

#### **The Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5 and 10-20 Under 35 USC § 103 (a)**

Claims 1, 2, 5, 10-20 were rejected under 35 USC § 103 (a) as being obvious by the Chester publication (Mastering Excel 97, published in 1997 by SYBEX Inc.) in view of the Courter et al publication (Mastering Microsoft Office 2000 Professional Edition, published in 1999 by SYBEX Inc).

In response, the Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 10, and 12, and dependent claims 2 and 5; 11; 13, 14, 16 and 18; respectively, to more particularly point out the invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the recitation of “receiving, by the client, the requested calculator web page, wherein JavaScript Dynamic HyperText Markup Language (HTML) including functionality, format and content of the requested calculator web page is received”. Applicants also amended Claim 1 to delete the recitation of: “allowing the user to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable, and to change at least one of the non-editable cells to editable.” Applicants respectfully submit that the neither the Chester publication, the Courter publication nor the Pollack patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,403,733, filed 6/23/2000, patented 12/10/2002) teach or suggest, implicitly or explicitly, alone or in combination, the recitations of the Claim 1.

The Chester publication is directed to a spreadsheet which is created using Excel 97. After creating a spreadsheet in Excel 97, Excel 97 allows that spreadsheet to be posted to the Web. Page 961 of the Chester publication states that “you can create an HTML Web page from the data and objects on a worksheet, and ultimately publish the page at a Web site.” As noted by the Examiner, however, “Chester’s publish to the web feature, as described for the Excel 97 spreadsheet application, produces non-interactive web pages....” [1/2006 Office Action, pg. 5].

The Examiner asserts that Courter teaches the use of interactive web pages that allow spreadsheet functions to be interactive when the web page is converted into a web page citing a passage which describes Office Web Components. [1/2006 Office Action, pp. 5-6]. The Courter publication is directed to Microsoft Office 2000. Special software (i.e., Microsoft Office Web Components) must be used in conjunction with a web browser to provide an interactive spreadsheet on a web page using Microsoft Office 2000.

According to the Office 2000 White Paper: Browser Compatibility on page 16 (Item CA on the PTO-1449 of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on April 11, 2006):

“Publishing Using the Interactive Web Components

Excel has a feature that allows the user to publish a spreadsheet and create a document that uses the new Microsoft Office Web Components (comprised of the Spreadsheet, PivotTable®, and Chart components). These components are ActiveX® controls that run in the browser to allow tables to recalculate and charts to update as data is changed, as well providing the ability to use PivotTable views in the browser. ActiveX technologies are not supported in any of the Netscape browsers, so these features do not appear when viewed in any Netscape browser. Web charts, PivotTable views, and interactive worksheets are supported by Microsoft Internet Explorer version 4.01 and later.”

Applicants respectfully point out that the Office 2000 White Paper: Web Components, on page 6 (Item CB on the PTO-1449 of the Information Disclosure Statement submitted on April 11, 2006), states:

“When a user who has not installed Office 2000 browses a Web page containing references to the Office Web Components, Microsoft Internet Explorer detects that the components are not installed, and then downloads them automatically from the corporate Office installation server.”

The Office 2000 White Paper: Web Components article on page 7, states:

“If you browse a Web page that contains Web Components and you can't run them, you will see the following text on your page:

‘To use this Web page interactively, you must have Microsoft® Internet Explorer 4.01 or later and the Microsoft Office Web Components. See the Microsoft Office Web site for more information.’”

According to the aforementioned description of Microsoft Office 2000, special software (Office Web Components) and a web browser was required in order for the user to work with a calculator, or calculator web page. In contrast to Office 2000, the claimed invention allows a user to change content in at least one cell of a calculator web page in the web browser without additional software. The claimed invention recites: “receiving, by the client, a requested calculator web page, wherein JavaScript Dynamic HyperText Markup Language (HTML) including functionality, format and content of the requested calculator web page is received; displaying the requested calculator web page in the web browser in a calculator mode, wherein the web browser executes the JavaScript Dynamic HTML, the requested calculator web page comprising one or more editable cells and one or more non-editable cells, wherein the editable cells are displayed with a visually distinct indication from the non-editable cells via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML; and allowing, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML being executed by the web browser, a user to change content in the editable cells and not allowing the user to change content in the non-editable cells in the displayed calculator web page in the web browser.” Because the JavaScript Dynamic HyperText Markup Language (HTML) includes functionality, format and content of the requested calculator web page, the web browser, without additional software, can display the calculator web page and allow, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML being executed by the web browser, a user to change content in the editable cells and not allowing the user to change content in the non-editable cells in the displayed calculator web page in the web browser.

Neither the Chester publication nor the Courter publication teach or suggest, implicitly or explicitly, alone or in combination, all the recitations of the claimed invention. In addition, the Pollack patent does not teach the claimed invention. The Pollack patent is directed to a method for inserting interactive HTML objects into an electronic file, such as an Internet web page. The Pollack patent, in column 1, lines 56-58, teaches “One method to help web site authors insert interactive HTML object into their web pages was to provide the HTML code for the interactive HTML object over the

internet.” In column 3, lines 22-24, the Pollack patent states: “Furthermore, the web site providing the interactive content includes some client-side script (such as JavaScript or VBScript) that automatically delivers the HTML to the authoring application.” However, the Pollack patent does not teach “a requested calculator web page, wherein JavaScript Dynamic HyperText Markup Language (HTML) including functionality, format and content of the requested calculator web page.” The Pollack patent also does not teach “allowing, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML being executed by the web browser, a user to change content in the editable cells and not allowing the user to change content in the non-editable cells in the displayed calculator web page in the web browser.”

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that neither the Chester publication, the Courter publication nor the Pollack patent, alone or in combination, implicitly or explicitly, teach or suggest all the recitations of Claim 1. Therefore Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable.

Because Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1, Claims 2-6 are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1.

#### Claim 6

Claim 6 depends from Claim 1 and contains additional distinguishing recitations not taught by the Chester publication, the Courter publication and the Pollack patent. Claim 6 recites the following recitations: “allowing, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML of the calculator web page, the user to edit the calculator web page as a web-based spreadsheet, wherein the web-based spreadsheet comprises JavaScript code that allows the user to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable, and to change at least one of the non-editable cells to editable in a calculator preview mode in the web browser.”

According to the Examiner, the Courter publication teaches the use of interactive web pages that allow spreadsheet functions to be interactive when converted into a web page. The rejection asserts that the Courter publication describes the web components for spreadsheets as: “with the Spreadsheet component, users can add formulas, sort and filter data and format the worksheet”. The rejection further asserts that the Chester publication therefore teaches a spreadsheet published to the web, where spreadsheet formatting control (the editability, or locking of a cell is a format control) is active, or enabled.

Applicants submit that even assuming that the static web page of the Chester publication is analogous to locking all the cells of the spreadsheet, that the Chester publication does not teach “allowing, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML of the calculator web page, the user to edit the calculator web page as a web-based spreadsheet, wherein the web-based spreadsheet comprises JavaScript code that allows the user to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable, and to change at least one of the non-editable cells to editable in a calculator preview mode in the web browser.”

Applicants respectfully submit that Office 2000, which the Courter publication describes, does not allow a user to change the editability of the cells of a spreadsheet web page in a web browser. “Excel 2000 for Windows for Dummies” by Harvey, previously cited by Applicants, referred to as the Harvey publication, teaches setting the editability of the cells of a spreadsheet prior to publishing the spreadsheet as a Web page. The Harvey publication, on page 319 states: “If you want to prevent your users from being able to change particular cells to the worksheet data, you need to protect the table or sheet prior to saving its data as a Web page.”

Furthermore, as disclosed in the Harvey publication, in Excel 2000 the only way to edit an HTML spreadsheet after publishing is to use a Web page editing tool outside the Web browser. The Harvey publication teaches that after creating an HTML,

that is, a web-based spreadsheet, that spreadsheet can be edited as follows: “You can edit the new Web pages that you create in Excel or the existing pages to which you’ve appended worksheet data with any Windows-based Web page editing tool. If you don’t have a favorite Web page editing program go ahead and use Word 2000 that comes as part of the Office 2000 suite of applications as your Web page (it is actually quite adequate and really good about shielding you from the behind-the-scenes HTML tags and weird XML scripts). Keep in mind that double-clicking a Web page file icon in the Windows Explorer or My Computer will only result in opening the Web page in your favorite Web browser (where you can look but you can’t touch). To open a Web page for editing, you must remember to launch a Web editor (like Word 2000 or, in some cases, Excel 2000) first and then use the editing program’s File⇒Open command to open the Web page that needs changing.” (The Harvey publication, p. 329).

Therefore, the editability of the cells of an HTML spreadsheet that was created using Excel 2000 can be changed, using either Excel 2000, Word 2000, or another Web page editing tool and then saving the changed spreadsheet as an HTML spreadsheet. The Chester, Courter and Harvey publications do not teach “allowing, via the JavaScript Dynamic HTML of the calculator web page, the user to edit the calculator web page as a web-based spreadsheet, wherein the web-based spreadsheet comprises JavaScript code that allows the user to change at least one of the editable cells to non-editable, and to change at least one of the non-editable cells to editable in a calculator preview mode in the web browser.”

Applicants also submit that the Pollack patent does not teach the recitations of Claim 6. For the foregoing additional reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 6 is patentable.

Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from Claim 6 and recites additional distinguishing recitations not disclosed by the Chester publication, the Courter publication and the Pollack patent.

Claim 5 recites recitations similar to Claim 16. Claim 16 was rejected based on the “shortcut menu” of the Chester publication. Chester recites: “A shortcut menu is a menu that you display by pointing at a certain object, then clicking the right mouse button.” Once the shortcut menu is displayed, the user provided additional input as to what action to take.

In contrast, in Claim 6, the “JavaScript code of the web-based spreadsheet allows a user to change said at least one of the non-editable cells to editable in response to clicking on said at least one of the editable cells without additional input, and to change said at least one of the editable cells to non-editable in response to clicking on said at least one of the non-editable cells without additional input.”

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicants submit that the Chester publication does not teach or suggest, explicitly or implicitly, the recitations of Claim 5. Therefore for the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 5 is patentable.

Claims 7-9

Independent Claim 7 has similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 1, therefore Applicants submit that Claim 7 is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claims 8 and 9 depend from Claim 7, and Applicants submit that Claims 8 and 9 are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 7.



Claim 10

Independent Claim 10 was rejected using the same rationale as Claim 1. Claim 10 has similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 6. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 10 is patentable for the same reasons as Claims 1 and 6. Claim 11 depends from Claim 10 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 10.

Claim 12

Independent Claim 12 contains similar distinguishing recitations as Claims 1 and 5; therefore Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 12 is patentable for the same reasons as Claims 1 and 5.

Independent Claim 12 recites: “displaying a web-based spreadsheet in the web browser using a calculator preview mode, the spreadsheet having cells, at least one of the cells of the spreadsheet depending on a value in one or more other cells of the spreadsheet, wherein any cells depending on the value in the other cells default to being non-editable cells, any editable cells being displayed with a distinct visual indication from said non-editable cells, the web-based spreadsheet comprising JavaScript code including functionality of the web-based spreadsheet, wherein said displaying comprises executing the JavaScript code by the web browser.” Therefore, the JavaScript code implements the functionality of “any cells depending on the value in the other cells default to being non-editable cells.” In contrast, the cited language of the Chester publication teaches that the user manually protects the worksheet. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 12 is patentable for the foregoing additional reason.

Claim 13

Claim 13 depends from Claim 12 and is patentable for the same reasons as claim 12.

Claim 14

Claim 14 depends from Claim 12 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 12.

Claim 14 also recites additional distinguishing recitations. Claim 14 recites the recitations of “the designer/creator is at the client, the client comprising a Data Array file of cell descriptions having values that are loadable from JavaScript of the web-based spreadsheet, further comprising: in response to the designer/creator selecting to save the web-based spreadsheet, the client sends the cell descriptions to a server, the server writing the cells descriptions to a Spreadsheet/Calculator data file.” Applicants submit that neither the Chester publication, the Courter publication nor the Pollack patent teach or suggest, alone or in combination, explicitly or implicitly, all the recitations of Claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 is patentable for the foregoing additional reason.

Claims 15, 16, and 17

Claims 15, 16 and 17 depend from Claim 12 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 12.

Claims 18, 19 and 20

Claim 18 depends from Claim 14 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 14. Claims 19 and 20 depend from Claim 18 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 18.

Claims 25, 26 and 27

Claim 25 has similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 1 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claims 26 and 27 depend from Claim 25, and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 25.

Claims 28, 29 and 30

Independent Claim 28 has been amended to more particularly point out the invention. Claim 28 has similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 1 and Claim 5 and is patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1 and Claim 5. Claims 29 and 30 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention. Claims 29 and 30 depend from Claim 28 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 28.

Claims 31, 32 and 33

Independent Claim 31 has been amended to more particularly point out the invention. Claim 31 has similar distinguishing recitations as Claim 1 and is therefore patentable for the same reasons as Claim 1. Claims 31 and 33 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention. Claims 31 and 33 depend from Claim 31 and are patentable for the same reasons as Claim 31.

Conclusion

Consequently, the Applicants believe that all these claims are presently in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

April 11, 2006



Janet M. Skafar, Attorney

Reg. No. 41,315

Correspondence Customer No. 24852

Message Telephone: (408)463-5670

Facsimile: (408) 463-4827